

same time ensuring that Americans get maximum value from the taxes they pay.

Dr. Heustis has been a champion in the drive to ensure that our veterans are satisfied with the treatment they receive at the Pettis Memorial VA Medical Center. Under his leadership, the staff has met every challenge and has gained a reputation for quality care and sensitive treatment of veterans.

Over the years, the Jerry L. Pettis Memorial VA Medical Center has become highly respected as a teaching hospital. Working in close affiliation with Loma Linda University Medical Center, the VA medical center has provided a training ground for student doctors for nearly two decades. With its international reputation as a medical innovator, Loma Linda University has provided many benefits for the veterans at the VA, as well.

Dr. Heustis has taken a direct role in this relationship as a professor of pathology at the university, co-medical director of the School of Cytotechnology, and associate dean for veterans affairs. He has also published numerous articles in medical journals, and been a regular presenter at scientific symposiums. He has been named the "highest-rated lecturer" at sixteen symposiums since 1986, and received the Scissors Award from the Healthcare Leadership Institute in 2000.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Darryl Heustis has met the highest professional standards as a medical doctor, ensured top-notch care for hundreds of thousands of veterans, and overseen the education of countless student doctors over the past 25 years. Please join me in thanking him for his service to his community and our Nation, and wishing him well in his future endeavors.

#### RESOLUTIONS TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST IRAQ

**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 25, 2002*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress face few decisions as important for their constituents as the issue of war or peace—sending young men and women into combat. And now, protecting Americans from terror attacks in the U.S. is equally vital. These crucial questions truly call for us to put aside political calculation and do what is right and best for America. These issues also call for us to resist a rush to judgment. We must take time to ensure that they are carefully weighed and thoroughly aired.

I oppose the resolution requested by President Bush that would give him a blank check to start a war against Iraq at any time and in any manner that he chooses. This clearly is too broad. It authorizes the President to act unilaterally no matter what the U.N. decides or does. That would abdicate congressional responsibility and is reminiscent of the equally open-ended Tonkin Gulf Resolution in 1964. It also fails to limit his authority to working within the U.N. framework on peaceful measures to enforce U.N. sanctions. Finally, the President's proposal embodies his alarming new doctrine of pre-emptive U.S. attacks on other nations even when they pose no imminent threat to the U.S.

Instead, I join with many of my colleagues who support a more sensible, more justified

and far less dangerous position: we advocate that the U.S. pursue inspections through the U.N., while continuing to deter Saddam Hussein, as we have been able to do for the past decade. To implement this view, we have introduced an alternative resolution endorsing President Bush's request for U.N. inspections.

The Administration simply has not made the case that Iraq threatens the United States with weapons of mass destruction, and that we are in such imminent danger of attack that U.S. military action is either the prudent or the justified course. Everyone agrees that Saddam Hussein is a very brutal dictator. He has: ruthlessly repressed his own people; committed aggression in the past; violated U.N. sanctions; sought to develop weapons of mass destruction; and remained hostile to the United States.

But that does not end the matter, for two reasons. First, the same could be said for any number of other countries, such as North Korea, China, and Iran. Will the U.S. attack each of them, and others, because some day they might be able to threaten us with weapons of mass destruction?

Second, even if a "regime change" in Iraq is desirable, that does not justify taking military action when it would risk so many dangers to America. Attacking Iraq will increase rather than decrease the likelihood of Saddam Hussein's launching whatever weapons he does have against Israel, against our other allies, or against U.S. forces stationed in that region—a risk that even Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld acknowledged in recent congressional testimony. At present, Hussein is deterred by our threat of retaliatory destruction. He knows that, if he were to use weapons of mass destruction against us, then we would retaliate and destroy him. There is no evidence that Hussein seeks to commit suicide. But if we attack first, after announcing an intent to wipe him out, then what reason would he have to hold back?

A U.S. attack poses other severe dangers: American military commanders fear it would dilute our fight against al Qaida. We have not yet captured those who killed thousands of Americans, and who, we know, are still trying to kill more. That is job number one.

America's attacking Iraq alone would ignite a firestorm of anti-American fervor in the Middle East and Muslim world and breed thousands of new potential terrorists.

As we see in Afghanistan, there would be chaos and inter-ethnic conflict following Saddam's departure. A post-war agreement among them to cooperate peacefully in a new political structure would not be self-executing. Iraq would hardly become overnight a shining "model democracy" for the Middle East. We would need a U.S. peacekeeping force and nation-building efforts there for years. Despite rosy predictions that the Iraqi people would welcome our soldiers and aid workers with open arms, they would be arriving after years of U.S.-led economic sanctions, followed by violent U.S. bombing and combat. They will be the constant target of local hostility and terrorist attacks.

If we violate the U.N. Charter and unilaterally assault another country when it is not yet a matter of necessary self-defense, then we will set a dangerous precedent, paving the way for any other nation that chooses to do so, too, including those with nuclear weapons such as India and Pakistan and China.

We will trigger an arms-race of nations accelerating and expanding their efforts to develop weapons of destruction, so that they can deter "pre-emptive" hostile action by the U.S. Do we really want to open this Pandora's box?

The war, plus the need to rebuild Iraq and create a united, peaceful country, would cost billions of dollars badly needed at home. For millions of Americans, the biggest threat to their security in the lack of decent wage jobs, health insurance or affordable housing for their families. For senior citizens, it is their need to choose between buying enough food and buying prescription drugs. Indeed, most Americans are more frightened about security at our airports than about some strutting dictator thousands of miles away. Yet the Bush Administration's deficit budget won't even permit meeting the year-end deadline for installing new baggage and passenger screening systems to protect us against an immediate threat here at home.

The huge costs of war and nation building, which will increase our deficit, along with the impact of the likely sharp rise in oil prices, will deal a double-barreled blow to our currently fragile economy.

If it were plausible that we had to attack Iraq now, in order to head off strategic threats to the United States in the near future—and if alternatives had been exhausted, then that overriding concern might justify the risk of all these harmful consequences that are certain to follow U.S. military action. But the Bush Administration has not presented persuasive evidence that Saddam will soon be able to threaten America with weapons of mass destruction, or that he is likely to use them against us. Until then, a U.S. pre-emptive attack makes no sense, in light of the risks it would create and the clear harm it would cause to our national interests.

In fact, it is precisely because they lack such evidence that the President, Secretary Rumsfeld and Vice President CHENEY have increasingly downplayed claims of an impending nuclear threat from Iraq and have switched to elaborating on what a bad person Saddam has been.

But such a departure from the principles of our tradition—an unprovoked attack initiated by the U.S.—cannot be justified merely because we would prefer another regime in Baghdad, or because someday Saddam Hussein might present an actual strategic threat to U.S. security.

In addition, Americans should ask the White House and the Congress about the timing of the vote on any IRAQ resolution. What's the rush? According to press reports, our military leaders have made clear they will not be ready to launch an attack for months, and would prefer to do so in January or February. Why, then, do we need to decide such a complex and consequential issue in a few days? Why cut short the national debate to which the American people are entitled? Is it because the Administration is aware that a growing number of Americans are troubled by all of the unanswered questions? Americans are puzzled why Iraq has suddenly become such a threat that the White House is prepared to go to war and shed the blood of American men and women, not to mention great numbers of innocent Iraqi civilians.

They are right to ask. What has changed in the last six months or year that suddenly makes an attack on Iraq the leading item on

the Administration's agenda? All of the reasons now being cited by the White House—Hussein's bad character, his past behavior, the outstanding unfulfilled U.N. resolutions and his continued pursuit of strategic weaponry—were equally true back then.

I would hope that this headlong rush to judgment does not have anything to do with the November elections.

I expect the Bush Administration to present very soon some conveniently last-minute "new evidence" in order to support its promised new National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) assessing Iraq's capabilities. It is very odd that, as of last week—so many months after Iraq had become the leading headline issue—the Administration had still not completed an all-source, inter-agency assessment of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and future capacity:

Is this because the White House knew it would be unhappy with the result?

Is it because the Administration was unable to pressure all of the intelligence agencies to reach the "right" conclusions?

Is it because the White House has been pressing the Intelligence Community to find some new "evidence" that could be artfully interpreted to support Administration policy?

Mr. Speaker, It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that one or more of these considerations played a role in the otherwise inexplicable delay. Therefore, I have asked the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Intelligence to vigorously investigate what dissents any of the intelligence agencies may have registered from the NIE's overall conclusions, from its component findings and from its assumption—either in the final document, or in earlier comments on discussion drafts.

This summer, several major newspapers reported that senior officers at the Pentagon, including members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff did not believe that Iraq posed a sufficient threat to the U.S. to warrant the risks and the costs of a war. Now they apparently have been brought on board a White House war train that is about to leave the station. Why have they suddenly reversed their position? I trust their initial professional judgment.

In these tense times, we should keep in mind the recent warning from another military leader, General Anthony Zinni, who was Marine Commandant and also has headed our Armed Forces Central Command, which guards our interests in the Middle East. He currently is a key advisor on that region to the Administration. General Zinni reminded us that military commanders, who know the full horrors of war are hesitant to plunge ahead unless the national interest is clearly at stake, while those who have never worn a uniform or seen combat often are the ones who most easily and enthusiastically beat the drums of war.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 25, 2002*

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, due to business in my district, I was unable to vote during the following rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated: rollcall No. 400

"yea"; rollcall No. 401 "yea"; rollcall No. 402 "yea"; and rollcall No. 403 "yea."

#### COMMEMORATION OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

#### HON. NICK J. RAHALL, II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 25, 2002*

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, "We must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill," the Puritan preacher John Winthrop proclaimed, as he and his followers sailed for America and freedom. "The eyes of all people are upon us." And so they have remained for nearly four centuries. Many have looked to us in awe, inspired by a nation rooted in liberty. Others have hated the ideal we embody, and wished us ill. But none can remove us from their gaze.

Today, America's economic prosperity, military power, and technological advancement are without peer. Our daily comforts and conveniences exceed those available to most of the six billion people who inhabit the earth. But the ease of our lives does not render us soft, or reluctant to retaliate when attacked. A year ago, all the world watched in horror as a small gang of wicked men took three thousand innocent lives in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania.

Since the moment the first airplane struck the first tower, Americans have shown, both on the battlefield and at home, the strength of our spirit, the mettle of our souls, and the force of our arms. From the firefighters climbing to their deaths, to the airline passengers who battled back, to the precious West Virginia sons and daughters who gave their lives in Afghanistan, the world has witnessed acts of American selflessness and bravery that rival the most revered in the annals of human history.

Just as Winthrop defined America's place in the world, he described how we must live to maintain it. "We must delight in each other," he instructed. "Make others' conditions our own; rejoice together; mourn together; labor and suffer together." Our whole nation suffered the same grievous wound on September 11. Those who delivered the blow hoped it would inaugurate our destruction. Instead, they inspired America's return to the community values and mutual commitment upon which our country was built.

The attacks, the ongoing war, and the continuing threats spur us to embrace again our founding ideas: that all men and women are created equal; that America's destiny is the world's destiny—to secure life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that we cannot allow the centuries-old, world-wide fight for freedom to falter. This recollection of our original rights and responsibilities is a fitting tribute, is an apt memorial, to the lives that were lost and devastated on that sad September day.

#### CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF DOROTHY "DOTTIE" KAY JACKSON

#### HON. DIANE E. WATSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 25, 2002*

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Dorothy Kay Jackson was born on July 1, 1943 in Detroit, Michigan. She was the third child born to Lawrence Homer Moore, Sr. and Edna Moore Osborne who preceded her in death. In addition to her parents she was preceded in death by her second father, Willis "Pops" Osbornes and her brother, John Alfred Moore. The family moved from Detroit in the summer of 1945 to Los Angeles. Dorothy attended public schools in Los Angeles and graduated from Los Angeles High School with honors in 1961.

As a youngster, "Dottie" as she was known to her family, was introduced to the arts at an early age taking up tap dance, piano, and choral lessons. Her love of music and the arts continued throughout her life. Baptized at Trinity Baptist Church, Dorothy accepted Christ at an early age. She attended church regularly and participated in Sunday school and bible classes. She continued her involvement in church activities until her health failed.

An old African proverb states that "It takes a whole village to raise a child." Dorothy epitomized this concept which became a reality in the community where she grew up known as the Hobart Street "village"—a group of families in her neighborhood who bonded and acted as a family unit. Dottie gave music lessons to younger children in the neighborhood and continued to teach Music throughout her high school and college career. Although members of the village settled in areas world wide—Poland, Paris, Massachusetts, Arizona, and of course California—the Hobart family remains united and in touch today.

Dorothy attended public schools in Los Angeles and graduated from L.A. High School with honors in 1959. She earned an A.A. Degree at East Los Angeles Junior College. While attending East Los Angeles, she met and married Charles G. Jackson in 1962. From this union one daughter, Shelley Darnell Jackson, was born. Dorothy demonstrated diligence, dedication and determination in family matters. While she was pursuing her education, she provided exemplary care and nurturing to her daughter and children of other family members. Later she received a Bachelor of Arts and a Master of Arts Degree at California State University, Los Angeles.

In 1966 she began her career and pursuit of excellence in education for children by working in the Early Childhood Education Program at Normandie Avenue School and subsequently accepted a fourth-grade teaching position at Sixth Avenue School. This devoted educator served the Los Angeles Unified School District for 33 years as a Teacher, Title I Coordinator, Area Advisor, Assistant Principal and Principal. Her last administrative assignment was Principal at Glen Feliz Elementary School. Due to her commitment to and understanding of education, she was appointed to the California Textbook Commission by Assembly Speaker Willie Brown in 1991.

Dottie, a multi-talented educator, made tremendous contributions to the school and community and received many honors and accolades including the "Woman of the Year" from